DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

RCRA Corrective Action
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA725)

Current Human Exposures Under Control

Facility Name:	Techalloy Company Inc.
Facility Address:	6509 Olson Road, Union, IL
Facility EPA ID #:	ILD 005 178 975

1. Has **all** available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to soil, groundwater, surface water/sediments, and air, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been **considered** in this EI determination?

_X_ If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.

____ If no - re-evaluate existing data, or

____ if data are not available skip to #6 and enter "IN" (more information needed) status code.

BACKGROUND

Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI

A positive "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that there are no "unacceptable" human exposures to "contamination" (i.e., contaminants in concentrations in excess of appropriate risk-based levels) that can be reasonably expected under current land- and groundwater-use conditions (for all "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Current Human Exposures Under Control" EI are for reasonably expected human exposures under current land- and groundwater-use conditions ONLY, and do not consider potential future land- or groundwater-use conditions or ecological receptors. The RCRA Corrective Action program's overall mission to protect human health and the environment requires that Final remedies address these issues (i.e., potential future human exposure scenarios, future land and groundwater uses, and ecological receptors).

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

2. Are groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, or air **media** known or reasonably suspected to be **"contaminated"**[1] above appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action (from SWMUs, RUs or AOCs)?

	Yes	No	?	Rationale / Key Contaminants
Groundwater	X			VOCs onsite and offsite, metals onsite
Air (indoors)[2]		X		
Surface Soil (e.g., <2 ft)	X			VOCs and metals onsite
Surface Water		X		
Sediment		X		
Subsurf. Soil (e.g., >2 ft)	X			VOCs and metals onsite
Air (outdoors)		X		

____ If no (for all media) - skip to #6, and enter "YE," status code after providing or citing appropriate "levels," and referencing sufficient supporting documentation demonstrating that these "levels" are not exceeded.

__X__ If yes (for any media) - continue after identifying key contaminants in each "contaminated" medium, citing appropriate "levels" (or provide an explanation for the determination that the medium could pose an unacceptable risk), and referencing supporting documentation.

____ If unknown (for any media) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s):

According to the June 1996 RFI Report (revised October 1996), the August 1997 CMS Report and the December 1997 Statement of Basis, onsite and offsite groundwater, and onsite surface and subsurface soil contain contaminants exceeding appropriately protective risk based levels (Region IX PRGs). Groundwater contains 1,1,1 Trichloroethane (TCA) as high as 51,000 ppb, trichloroethene (TCE) as high as 1,100 ppb, and lead as high as 0.288 ppm compared to a standard of 200 ppb for TCA, 5 ppb for TCE, and 0.015 ppm for lead. Onsite surface soil contains TCE as high as 1,600 ppm and lead as high as 77,100 ppm compared to a standard of 6.1 ppm for TCE and 750 ppm for lead. Onsite subsurface soil contains TCE as high as 240 ppb and chromium as high as 9,110 ppm, compared to a standard of 0.06 ppm for TCE and 38 ppm for chromium. Additional VOCs and metals also exceed appropriate standards.

Indoor air quality is not reasonably expected to be contaminated due to the fact that the impacted areas of the site are not covered by any buildings. Outdoor air quality has been measured and found not to exceed the standard set by IEPA of 3.54 tons/year of VOCs, therefore Techalloy was not required to obtain a specific air permit for its air sparge/SVE system. Surface water and sediment are not present near the facility, therefore have not been impacted.

---

[1] "Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriately protective risk-based "levels" (for the media, that identify risks within the acceptable risk range).

[2] Recent evidence (from the Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment, and others) suggest that unacceptable indoor air concentrations are more common in structures above groundwater with volatile contaminants than previously believed. This is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration necessary to be reasonably certain that indoor air (in structures located above (and adjacent to) groundwater with volatile contaminants) does not present unacceptable risks.

3. Are there **complete pathways** between "contamination" and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under the current (land- and groundwater-use) conditions?

Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table

Potential **Human Receptors** (Under Current Conditions)

"Contaminated" Media	Residents	Workers	Day-Care	Construction	Trespassers	Recreation	Food[3]
Groundwater	NO	NO	N/A	NO	NO	N/A	N/A
~~Air (indoors)~~							
Soil (surface, e.g., <2 ft)	NO	NO	N/A	NO	NO	N/A	N/A
~~Surface Water~~							
~~Sediment~~							
Soil (subsurface e.g., >2 ft)	NO	NO	N/A	NO	NO	N/A	N/A
~~Air (outdoors)~~							

Instructions for Summary Exposure Pathway Evaluation Table:

1. Strike-out specific Media including Human Receptors' spaces for Media which are not "contaminated" as identified in #2 above.

2. enter "yes" or "no" for potential "completeness" under each "Contaminated" Media – Human Receptor combination (Pathway).

Note: In order to focus the evaluation to the most probable combinations some potential "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combinations (Pathways) do not have check spaces ("___"). While these combinations may not be probable in most situations they may be possible in some settings and should be added as necessary.

X If no (pathways are not complete for any contaminated media-receptor combination) - skip to #6, and enter "YE" status code, after explaining and/or referencing condition(s) in-place, whether natural or man-made, preventing a complete exposure pathway from each contaminated medium (e.g., use optional Pathway Evaluation Work Sheet to analyze major pathways).

___ If yes (pathways are complete for any "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combination) - continue after providing supporting explanation.

___ If unknown (for any "Contaminated" Media - Human Receptor combination) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s):

There are several remedial measures in place at the Techalloy facility which prevent any complete pathways between the contamination and human receptors such that exposures can be reasonably expected under current conditions. These remedial measures were selected by U.S. EPA in the Final Decision and Response to Comments signed by U.S. EPA on May 26, 1998.

---

[3] Indirect Pathway/Receptor (e.g., vegetables, fruits, crops, meat and dairy products, fish, shellfish, etc.)

Currently, McHenry County has restricted the use of groundwater as a potable source of drinking water within the area of the contained groundwater plume. Also impacted residents to the west of the Techalloy facility have been connected to the City of Union public water supply which is not impacted by the groundwater plume. Techalloy has incorporated within its Property Deed a restriction on the use of groundwater as a potable drinking water source at the facility and has restricted the Techalloy property to industrial use only. These measures ensure contaminated groundwater is not consumed at or around the Techalloy facility.

Contaminated soils which only occur at the Techalloy property have been covered with an 8-ounce geotextile membrane and 8-9 inches of aggregate (crushed limestone). Part of the area has also been paved with 6 inches of asphalt. The remaining area will be paved in spring. The facility is also secure, including an 8 foot barbed wire fence surrounding the area of contamination. These measures prevent residents, onsite workers, and any potential trespassers from coming in contact with the contaminated soils at the Techalloy facility.

4. Can the **exposures** from any of the complete pathways identified in #3 be reasonably expected to be **"significant"**[4] (i.e., potentially "unacceptable" because exposures can be reasonably expected to be: 1) greater in magnitude (intensity, frequency and/or duration) than assumed in the derivation of the acceptable "levels" (used to identify the "contamination"); or 2) the combination of exposure magnitude (perhaps even though low) and contaminant concentrations (which may be substantially above the acceptable "levels") could result in greater than acceptable risks)?

   _____ If no (exposures can not be reasonably expected to be significant (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") for any complete exposure pathway) - skip to #6 and enter "YE" status code after explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the complete pathways) to "contamination" (identified in #3) are not expected to be "significant."

   _____ If yes (exposures could be reasonably expected to be "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") for any complete exposure pathway) - continue after providing a description (of each potentially "unacceptable" exposure pathway) and explaining and/or referencing documentation justifying why the exposures (from each of the remaining complete pathways) to "contamination" (identified in #3) are not expected to be "significant."

   _____ If unknown (for any complete pathway) - skip to #6 and enter "IN" status code

   Rationale and Reference(s):

[4] If there is any question on whether the identified exposures are "significant" (i.e., potentially "unacceptable") consult a human health Risk Assessment specialist with appropriate education, training and experience.

5. Can the "significant" **exposures** (identified in #4) be shown to be within **acceptable** limits?

_____ If yes (all "significant" exposures have been shown to be within acceptable limits) - continue and enter "YE" after summarizing and referencing documentation justifying why all "significant" exposures to "contamination" are within acceptable limits (e.g., a site-specific Human Health Risk Assessment).

_____ If no (there are current exposures that can be reasonably expected to be "unacceptable")- continue and enter "NO" status code after providing a description of each potentially "unacceptable" exposure.

_____ If unknown (for any potentially "unacceptable" exposure) - continue and enter "IN" status code

Rationale and Reference(s):

6. Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Current Human Exposures Under Control EI event code (CA725), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (and attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility):

__X___ YE - Yes, "Current Human Exposures Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI Determination, "Current Human Exposures" are expected to be "Under Control" at the **Techalloy Company, Inc. Facilty in Union, IL** under current and reasonably expected conditions. This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency/State becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.

_____ NO - "Current Human Exposures" are NOT "Under Control."

_____ IN - More information is needed to make a determination.

Completed by (signature) Allen T. Wojtas Date 12/10/01
(print) Allen T. Wojtas
(title) Environmental Engineer

OW

Supervisor (signature) for Joseph M. Boyle, Chief CAS Date 12/13/01
(print) Joseph M. Boyle
(title) Chief, ECAB
(EPA Region or State) EPA Region 5

Locations where References may be found:

U.S. EPA Records Center, 77 West Jackson Blvd. Chicago, IL

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name) Allen T. Wojtas
(phone #) (312) 886-6194
(e-mail) wojtas.allen@epa.gov

FINAL NOTE: THE HUMAN EXPOSURES EI IS A QUALITATIVE SCREENING OF EXPOSURES AND THE DETERMINATIONS WITHIN THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD NOT BE USED AS THE SOLE BASIS FOR RESTRICTING THE SCOPE OF MORE DETAILED (E.G., SITE-SPECIFIC) ASSESSMENTS OF RISK.

DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99
RCRA Corrective Action
Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750)

Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control

Facility Name:	Techalloy
Facility Address:	6509 Olson Road, Union IL
Facility EPA ID #:	ILD 005 178 975

1. Has **all** available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the groundwater media, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units (SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been **considered** in this EI determination?

X If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.

____ If no - re-evaluate existing data, or

____ if data are not available skip to #6 and enter"IN" (more information needed) status code.

BACKGROUND

Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

Definition of "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI

A positive "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater has stabilized, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the original "area of contaminated groundwater" (for all groundwater "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

Relationship of EI to Final Remedies

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI pertains ONLY to the physical migration (i.e., further spread) of contaminated ground water and contaminants within groundwater (e.g., non-aqueous phase liquids or NAPLs). Achieving this EI does not substitute for achieving other stabilization or final remedy requirements and expectations associated with sources of contamination and the need to restore, wherever practicable, contaminated groundwater to be suitable for its designated current and future uses.

Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e.,

RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

2. Is **groundwater** known or reasonably suspected to be **"contaminated"**[1] above appropriately protective "levels" (i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines, guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?

X If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation.

____ If no - skip to #8 and enter "YE" status code, after citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not "contaminated."

____ If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s):

The June 1996 RCRA Facility Investigation (RFI) Report (revised in October 1996), the August 1997 Corrective Measures Study (CMS), and the December 1997 Statement of Basis document the presence of contaminant levels above Federal guidelines in groundwater. Highest on-site concentration of contaminants found in groundwater identified in the RFI: Trichloroethane (TCA) at 51,000 parts per billion (ppb); 1,1 Dichloroethene (DCE) at 4500 ppb; Trichloroethene (TCE) at 960 ppb; Tetrachloroethene (PCE) at 940 ppb. Safe Drinking Water Act Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) for TCA, DCE, TCE and PCE are 200 ppb, 7 ppb, 5 ppb and 5 ppb, respectively. Highest off-site groundwater concentrations were: TCA = 1900 ppb; DCE = 180 ppb; TCE = 1100 ppb; PCE = 150 ppb.

Footnotes:

[1]"Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form, NAPL and/or dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriate "levels" (appropriate for the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).

3. Has the **migration** of contaminated groundwater **stabilized** (such that contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater"[2] as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?

X If yes - continue, after presenting or referencing the physical evidence (e.g., groundwater sampling/measurement/migration barrier data) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of the "existing area of groundwater contamination"[2]).

___ If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the "existing area of groundwater contamination"[2]) - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after providing an explanation.

___ If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s):

The RCRA Facility Investigation Report (RFI) (June 1996; rev. Oct. 1996) reports elevated volatile and semivolatile organic compounds in groundwater beneath the Techalloy facility. The RFI also documents extensive offsite migration of contaminants in groundwater. To provide protection to downgradient groundwater users, two interim corrective measures have been employed. The first, a private well sampling program, was initiated in 1993. Semi-annual sampling of downgradient private wells provide residential users with information concerning their wells. If contaminant levels exceed regulatory guidelines (i.e., Maximum Contaminant Levels, or MCLs) at the well, users will be provided, at Techalloy's expense, with either connection to the municipal well system or installation of a filtering system on the user's well. The Administrative Consent Order for the implementation of the corrective measures (CMI Order), dated September 30, 1999, calls for quarterly groundwater sampling for the first year, and semi-annual residential well sampling thereafter, provided groundwater concentrations remain below MCLs. The most recent sampling event (January 1999) indicated no contaminant levels greater than the MCLs at the residential wells. A second interim measure involved the design and construction of a groundwater recovery system (pump & treat system). This system consists of two high production recovery wells – the first of which was operational in December 1996, the second in November 1998) which serve to draw in contaminated groundwater from the furthest boundary of the migrating contaminated groundwater (i.e., perimeter of plume). The "inward hydraulic gradient" thereby produced by the extraction wells serves as a protective "barrier" which prevents the contaminants from traveling further and further away, toward either other residents or the Kishwaukee River. As part of the final remedy, Techalloy will install and operate an above-ground groundwater treatment system, which will remove contaminants in groundwater to safe levels. Organic contaminants in the unsaturated zone will be treated by a soil vapor extraction system. Contaminated soils (containing metals) will be stabilized and capped, thereby providing a significant reduction in potential for future leaching of contaminants into the groundwater. In summary, current groundwater containment measures are protective of downgradient private well users and the nearby surface water body. Future corrective action measures, coupled with natural attenuation processes, will provide, in the long term, restoration of the aquifer.

[2] "existing area of contaminated groundwater" is an area (with horizontal and vertical dimensions) that has been verifiably demonstrated to contain all relevant groundwater contamination for this determination, and is defined by designated (monitoring) locations proximate to the outer perimeter of "contamination" that can and will be sampled/tested in the future to physically verify that all "contaminated" groundwater remains within this area, and that the further migration of "contaminated" groundwater is not occurring. Reasonable allowances in the proximity of the monitoring locations are permissible to incorporate formal remedy decisions (i.e., including public participation) allowing a limited area for natural attenuation.

4. Does "contaminated" groundwater **discharge** into **surface water** bodies?

____ If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.

__X__ If no - skip to #7 (and enter a "YE" status code in #8, if #7 = yes) after providing an explanation and/or referencing documentation supporting that groundwater "contamination" does not enter surface water bodies.

____ If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s):

5. Is the **discharge** of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be **"insignificant"** (i.e., the maximum concentration[3] of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their appropriate groundwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of discharging contaminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for unacceptable impacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-systems at these concentrations)?

____ If yes - skip to #7 (and enter "YE" status code in #8 if #7 = yes), after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration[3] of key contaminants discharged above their groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) provide a statement of professional judgement/explanation (or reference documentation) supporting that the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is not anticipated to have unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface water, sediments, or eco-system.

____ If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration[3] of each contaminant discharged above its groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) for any contaminants discharging into surface water in concentrations[3] greater than 100 times their appropriate groundwater "levels," the estimated total amount (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants that are being discharged (loaded) into the surface water body (at the time of the determination), and identify if there is evidence that the amount of discharging contaminants is increasing.

____ If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.

Rationale and Reference(s):

[3] As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

6. Can the **discharge** of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water be shown to be "**currently acceptable**" (i.e., not cause impacts to surface water, sediments or eco-systems that should not be allowed to continue until a final remedy decision can be made and implemented[4])?

____ If yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorporating these conditions, or other site-specific criteria (developed for the protection of the site's surface water, sediments, and eco-systems), and referencing supporting documentation demonstrating that these criteria are not exceeded by the discharging groundwater; OR 2) providing or referencing an interim-assessment,[5] appropriate to the potential for impact, that shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is (in the opinion of a trained specialists, including ecologist) adequately protective of receiving surface water, sediments, and eco-systems, until such time when a full assessment and final remedy decision can be made. Factors which should be considered in the interim-assessment (where appropriate to help identify the impact associated with discharging groundwater) include: surface water body size, flow, use/classification/habitats and contaminant loading limits, other sources of surface water/sediment contamination, surface water and sediment sample results and comparisons to available and appropriate surface water and sediment "levels," as well as any other factors, such as effects on ecological receptors (e.g., via bio-assays/benthic surveys or site-specific ecological Risk Assessments), that the overseeing regulatory agency would deem appropriate for making the EI determination.

____ If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater can not be shown to be "**currently acceptable**") - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after documenting the currently unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-systems.

____ If unknown - skip to 8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s):

[4] Note, because areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia) for many species, appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that could eliminate these areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface water bodies.

[5] The understanding of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently unacceptable impacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.

7. Will groundwater **monitoring** / measurement data (and surface water/sediment/ecological data, as necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area of contaminated groundwater?"

X If yes - continue after providing or citing documentation for planned activities or future sampling/measurement events. Specifically identify the well/measurement locations which will be tested in the future to verify the expectation (identified in #3) that groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as necessary) beyond the "existing area of groundwater contamination."

____ If no - enter "NO" status code in #8.

____ If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.

Rationale and Reference(s):

The CMI Order requires Techalloy to continue the private well sampling program on a quarterly basis for one year. Subsequent years will be reduced to a semi-annual basis if the first year indicates no increased contaminant concentrations. The CMI Order also requires Techalloy to continue, for 30 years, its groundwater pump & treat system.

8. Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control EI (event code CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility).

X YE - Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI determination, it has been determined that the "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the Techalloy facility , EPA ID # **ILD 005 178 975** , located at 6509 Olson Road, Union, IL. Specifically, this determination indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater is under control, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the "existing area of contaminated groundwater" This determination will be re-evaluated when the Agency becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.

___ NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected.

___ IN - More information is needed to make a determination.

Completed by	(signature)	Michael Valentino	Date 09/30/99
	(print)	Michael Valentino	
	(title)	Environmental Engineer	

Supervisor	(signature)		Date 09/30/99
	(print)	Joseph M. Boyle	
	(title)	Branch Chief, ECAB	
	(EPA Region or State)	Region 5	

9-30-99

Locations where References may be found:
EPA Files at EPA offices in Chicago, Site Information Repository (Morengo Public Library)

Contact telephone and e-mail numbers

(name)	Michael Valentino
(phone #)	(312) 886-4582
(e-mail)	valentino.michael@epa.gov